

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed.

The undersigned attorney would like to thank Examiners Talbot and Ross for the courtesies extended to him during the personal interview on November 15, 2006.

At the interview, an agreement was reached. The Examiners conceded that the attached independent Claims 1 and 6 appeared to overcome the art of record.

## **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) alleging them to be anticipated by Thomas (U.S. Patent No. 2,404,006).

As was pointed out at the interview, the Thomas reference fails to illustrate non-rotary movement. Thomas illustrates a collar 11 which, in turn, rotates the screw 22 causing it to move in the shank. Clearly, this is unlike Applicant's claims.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by GB 21999776.

The '776 application, like Thomas, illustrates rotation. The collar 40 rotatably moves along the threads 26 to move the jaw 16. Accordingly, this application fails to illustrate Applicant's claims.

### CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35. U.S.C. §103(a)


The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) alleging them to be unpatentable over Schliep (U.S. Patent No. 4,366,732) in view of Thomas.

Schliep, like Thomas, illustrates an adjustable nut 40 which rotates along the shank in order to move the jaws. This is unlike Applicant's claims.

These features were pointed out at the interview. The Examiners conceded that Claims 1 and 6, as now amended, overcame these references. Accordingly, Applicant believes Claims 1 and 6, as well as their dependent Claims 2-5 and 7-15, to be patentably distinct over the art cited by the Examiner.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to pass the case to issue at his earliest possible convenience. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present application, he should not hesitate to contact the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,



---

W.R. Duke Taylor  
Reg. No. 31,306  
Attorney for Applicants

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303  
(248) 641-1600

Date: November 16, 2006  
WRDT/lkj

Attorney Docket No. 0275S-001193